



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,662	03/25/2004	Mary Ellen Siksa	END920030154US1	7813
36380	7590	12/04/2007	EXAMINER	
RICHARD M. GOLDMAN 371 ELAN VILLAGE LANE SUITE 208, CA 95134			SHRESTHA, BIJENDRA K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,662

Applicant(s)

SIKSA, MARY ELLEN

Examiner

Bijendra K. Shrestha

Art Unit

3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/25/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Metzger, U.S. Pub No. 2004/0186760 (reference A in attached PTO-892).

3. As per claim 1, 11 and 21, Metzger teaches a computer system and method of reconciling records of resource consumption at a plurality of resource consumption sites for incorporation into aggregate business records of the resource consumption at a target site (see Fig. 1 and 2; paragraph [0023]), comprising the steps of:

a. collecting and recording resource consumption at resource consumption sites (see Fig. 1, In-Flight Terminal, paragraph [0026]; Fig. 7G; paragraphs [0052] and [0053]; where resource consumption sites are airlines having plurality of flights).

b. reconciling records of resource consumption between the resource consumption sites and the target site (see Fig. 1 and 2 paragraph [0023]; where target site is Facilitator Back-office Subsystem (208));

c. aggregating the records of resource consumption into aggregate business records of the resource consumption at the target site (see Fig. 1, Settlement (130); paragraph [0027]).

4. As per claim 2, 12 and 22, Metzger teaches the computer system and method wherein

the aggregate business records of the resource consumption at the target site comprise billing records (see Fig. 8A and 8B).

5. As per claim 3, 13 and 13, Metzger teaches the computer system and method comprising:

aggregating reconciled records of resource consumption into aggregate business records of the resource consumption at the target site (see Fig. 2, paragraph [0027]).

6. As per claim 4, 14 and 24, Metzger teaches the computer system and method comprising

aggregating the records of resource consumption into aggregate business records of the resource consumption at the target site and thereafter reconciling the aggregated records at the target site (see Fig. 2; paragraph [0027] and [0032]).

7. As per claims 7-9, 17-19 and 27-29, Metzger teaches the computer system and method wherein

the resource comprises electrical kilowatt hours, telephone connect time, liquids and gases chosen from the group consisting of fuels, chemical feedstocks, and water (see Fig. 4A, paragraph [0030]; the in flight inventory could include some of these items; telephone connect time include using telephone line during the flight; the Examiner

notes that this prior art can be applied to power supplies, telecommunication services as well).

8. As per claim 10, 20 and 30, Metzger teaches the computer system and method wherein

the aggregate business records are chosen from the group consisting of transfer records and invoices (see Fig. 4B, 8A and 8B).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 5-6, 15-16 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metzger U.S. Pub No. 2004/0186760 (reference A in attached PTO-892) in view of Tandon et al., U.S. Pub No. 2005/0177470 (reference B in attached PTO-892).

11. As per claim 5, 15 and 25, Metzger teaches computer system and method comprising reconciling the records in a reconciliation session comprising

a. retrieving the logs from the resource consumption feeder and interim control points (see Fig. 2, paragraph [0031]; where catering inventory is unloaded from Portable Terminal Device).

b. comparing at least one of:

i. resource consumption totals in the records from the resource consumption feeders with the resource consumption totals in the aggregated records at the target site (see paragraph [0023] ; where web portal and portable device promote reconciliation and accountability of catering and other flight inventory); and

ii. total number of resource consumption records forwarded from the resource consumption feeders with the total number of resource consumption records aggregated at the target site(see paragraph [0023] ; where web portal and portable device promote reconciliation and accountability of catering and other flight inventory);

Metzger does not teach c. issuing a notification, if an error is discovered; and

d. continuing comparing records until all records are reconciled if no errors are detected.

Tandon et al. teach c. issuing a notification, if an error is discovered; and

d. continuing comparing records until all records are reconciled if no errors are detected (see Fig. 3; paragraph [0037]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add issuing a notification, if an error is discovered; and continuing comparing records until all records are reconciled if no errors are detected of Metzger because Tandon et al. teach including above features would enable to identify any error immediately(Tandon et al., paragraph [0037], first sentence).

12. As per claim 6, 16 and 26, Metzger teaches computer system and method comprising reconciling the records in a reconciliation session comprising:

c. retrieving the logs from the resource consumption feeder and interim control points(see Fig. 2, paragraph [0031]; where catering inventory is unloaded from Portable Terminal Device);

d. comparing at least one of:

i. resource consumption totals in the records from the resource consumption feeders with the resource consumption totals in the aggregated records at the target site (see paragraph [0023] ; where web portal and portable device promote reconciliation and accountability of catering and other flight inventory); and

ii. total number of resource consumption records forwarded from the resource consumption feeders with the total number of resources consumption records aggregated at the target site(see paragraph [0023] ; where web portal and portable device promote reconciliation and accountability of catering and other flight inventory);

Metzger does not teach

a. logging the reconciliation session start time, b. retrieving the last session start time; and e. issuing a notification, logging session status, and ending the reconciliation if an error is discovered; and f. continuing comparing records, issuing a report, and logging session status if no errors are detected until all records are reconciled.

Tandon et al. teach

a. logging the reconciliation session start time, b. retrieving the last session start time (Tandon et al, Fig. 1, Login (202) and Schedule (204); paragraph [0033] and [0034]); and e. issuing a notification, logging session status, and ending the reconciliation if an error is discovered; and f. continuing comparing records, issuing a report, and logging session status if no errors are detected until all records are reconciled (see Fig. 3, step 310; paragraph [0037] and [0044]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add logging the reconciliation session start time, retrieving the last session start time and issuing a notification, logging session status, and ending the reconciliation if an error is discovered; and continuing comparing records, issuing a report, and logging session status if no errors are detected until all records are reconciled of Metzger because Tandon et al. teach including above features would enable validation of authorized user login and password data to allow access to stored financial data (Tandon et al., paragraph [0033]), schedule reconciliation sessions with remote terminals (paragraph [0034]), and rapid identification and reporting of any imbalance or un-reconciled data that may expose business to undue financial loss (paragraph [0018], last sentence).

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosures. Applicant is required under 37 CFR 1.111(c) to consider references fully when responding to this action.

The following are pertinent to current invention, though not relied upon:

Bracken et al. (U.S. Pub No. 2005/0044015) teach architecture for account reconciliation.

Crooks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,943,656) teach methods and systems for computerized bill consolidation.

Hwang (U.S. Pub No. 2005/0187852) teach method and system for account reconciliation in wealth management system.

Pinstov (U.S. Pub No. 2003/0036918) teaches system and method for trusted self-bill and payment for utilities including audit, verification, reconciliation and dispute resolution.

Provinse (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0026416) teaches system and method for account reconciliation.

Rahn et al. (U.S. pub No. 2004/0054685) teach pharmacy automated accounts receivable system and methods.

Rugge (U.S. Patent No. 7,240,028) teaches automated financial register reconciliation in a combined user interface.

Sandel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,758) teach reconciling database information among service providers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bijendra K. Shrestha whose telephone number is (571) 270-1374. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-4:30PM (Monday-Friday); 2nd Friday OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BKS/3691



ALEXANDER KALINOWSKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER